UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

DAWN MARIE BALL, : Civil No. 1:09-CV-773

Plaintiff :

: (Chief Judge Kane)

v.

: (Magistrate Judge Carlson)

C.O. HILL, <u>et al.</u>, :

Defendants :

ORDER

NOW, on this 21st day of December 2011, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT upon a de novo review of Magistrate Judge Carlson's October 13, 2011 Report and Recommendation (Doc. No. 62) and Plaintiff Dawn Marie Ball's objections thereto¹ (Doc. Nos. 64, 65), the Report and Recommendation (Doc. No. 62) is ADOPTED and Defendants' motions to dismiss (Doc. Nos. 43, 45) are GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART AS FOLLOWS:

- 1. All official capacity damages claims are **DISMISSED**;
- Superintendant Lamas, Major Bechdel, Deputy Shepler, Captain Robenolt, Captain Craver, Captain Moser, and Grievance Coordinator Troy Edwards are DISMISSED;
- 3. The motion to dismiss is **DENIED** in all other respects without prejudice to the submission of a subsequent more thoroughly documented dispositive motion.

¹ The objections relate solely to the Court's order referring this matter to Magistrate Carlson without Plaintiff's consent. As has been noted by both this Court and Magistrate Judge Carlson, the Federal Magistrates Act grants the Court the authority to refer matters to a magistrate judge without the consent of the parties including pretrial matters, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A), as well as dispositive motions, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B)-(C). See, e.g., Beazer E., Inc. v. Mead Corp., 412 F.3d 429, 438 (3d Cir. 2005) ("The Magistrates Act authorizes district courts to appoint magistrate judges to consider pretrial matters without regard to the parties' consent."); In re U.S. Healthcare, 159 F.3d 142, 145 (3d Cir. 1998) (noting district courts may refer dispositive motions to a magistrate judge for a report and recommendation without a party's consent).

S/ Yvette Kane
Yvette Kane, Chief Judge
United States District Court
Middle District of Pennsylvania